



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,959	08/10/2006	Satoshi Eguchi	1374.46346X00	4026
20457	7590	08/11/2009	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP			SLUTSKER, JULIA	
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1800			2891	
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/11/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dlee@antonelli.com  
rrodriguez@antonelli.com  
lthenor@antonelli.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/588,959	EGUCHI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	JULIA SLUTSKER	2891

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Julia Slutsker (Examiner). (3) William Solomon (Applicant's Representative).

(2) Asok Sarkar (Primary Examiner). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 August 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sukegawa (US 2003/0162370); Takahashi (US 6, 306, 211).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The difference between prior art and applicant's invention was discussed. Applicant's representative pointed out new limitations in the amended claim 1 that could overcome the existing prior art rejection. Applicant's representative also indicated that the RCE was filed. A new office action will be mailed in due time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.